



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/783,897	02/15/2001	John F. Morar	YOR920000719US1	4043

29683 7590 04/21/2005
HARRINGTON & SMITH, LLP
4 RESEARCH DRIVE
SHELTON, CT 06484-6212

EXAMINER

BAYAT, BRADLEY B

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3621

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/783,897

Applicant(s)

MORAR ET AL.

Examiner

Bradley B. Bayat

Art Unit

3621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 December 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-33,35-45 and 48-80 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-33,35-45 and 48-80 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 3621

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

Applicant has amended claims 1, 2, 6, 9, 10, 14, 15, 18-20, 25-28, 33, 37, 45, 49, 50, 56-60, 64, 65, 67, 68 and canceled claims 3, 34, 46, 47 in the amendment filed on 15 December 2004. Thus, claim 1, 2, 4-33, 35-45 and 48-80 remain pending.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1,2, 4-33, 35-45 and 48-80 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 4-33, 35-45 and 48-80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Papierniak et al. (hereinafter Papierniak, US 6,151,584) in view of Nagar et al. (hereinafter Nagar, US 6,404,143 B1).

1. Papierniak discloses a method for operating a data communication system, comprising:

- originating an electronic commerce transaction at a first party (column 4, line 49 – column 5, line 18);
- transmitting the electronic commerce transaction through the data communications network towards a second party (column 4, line 49 – column 5, line 18).

Papierniak does not explicitly disclose inputting an electronic commerce transaction filter that is interposed between two network components at a location where electronic commerce transaction related messages and message data are cast in a known form, using the electronic commerce transactions filter to interpret at least one characteristic of the electronic commerce transaction in a manner that is independent of a particular electronic commerce program that originated the electronic commerce related messages and message data; and in response to interpreting the at least one characteristic of the electronic commerce transaction, operating the electronic commerce transaction filter to take some action with respect to the electronic commerce transaction.

Nagar, however, teaches the use of scalable proxy servers with plug-in-filters wherein various filters can be plugged into the proxy server independent of any program and configured utilizing filter rules to take action or modify any request passed on to the proxy server processing (column 3, line 62-column 4, line 29; column 5, line 49-column 7, line 10; column 7, line 56-column 8, line 54).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Papierniak's method of supporting, collecting, and analyzing electronic commerce transactions by utilizing Nagar's plug-in filters that can independently be customized to analyze any data wherein multiple client processes connected to multiple proxy servers can filter requests and responses anywhere in between the client and server processes without the need to conform to a specified program or develop new software.

As per the following claims, Papierniak further discloses:

2. A method as in claim 1, wherein the action taken with respect to the electronic commerce transaction is an analysis of the electronic commerce transaction using information collected across an administrative domain and storing information generated by the analysis (columns 13-14).

4. A method as in claim 1, wherein the action taken with respect to the electronic commerce transaction is a modification of the electronic commerce transaction (columns 20-21).

5. A method as in claim 1, wherein the action taken with respect to the electronic commerce transaction is a redirection of the electronic commerce transaction to a third party (columns 15-16).

6. A method as in claim 1, wherein the action taken with respect to the electronic commerce transaction is an extraction of information from the e-commerce transaction and storing at least a portion of the extracted information (columns 7-8).

7. A method as in claim 1, wherein the action taken with respect to the electronic commerce transaction is a verification of the authenticity of the electronic commerce transaction (columns 9-10).

Art Unit: 3621

8. A method as in claim 1, wherein the action taken with respect to the electronic commerce transaction is a verification of the authenticity of a component part of the electronic commerce transaction (columns 9-10).

9. A method as in claim 1, wherein the action taken with respect to the electronic commerce transaction comprises a verification that the electronic commerce transaction is in compliance with a regulation (columns 12-13).

10. A method as in claim 1, wherein the action taken with respect to the electronic commerce transaction comprises a verification that the electronic commerce transaction is in compliance with a standard (columns 17-18).

11. A method as in claim 1, wherein the action taken with respect to the electronic commerce transaction is a termination of the electronic commerce transaction (columns 15-16).

12. A method as in claim 1, wherein the action taken with respect to the electronic commerce transaction is a delay of the electronic commerce transaction (column 19-20).

13. A method as in claim 1, wherein the action taken with respect to the electronic commerce transaction is an encryption of all or a part of the electronic commerce transaction, and sending the encrypted electronic commerce transaction to another destination (columns 3-4).

Art Unit: 3621

14. A method as in claim 1, wherein the action taken with respect to the electronic commerce transaction is generating an alert for the case where an analysis performed by the electronic commerce transaction filter indicates that at least one preexisting filtering criterion is met (figures 13 and associated text).

15. A method as in claim 1, wherein the action taken with respect to the electronic commerce transaction is passing the electronic commerce transaction through the electronic commerce transaction filter in an unmodified form and without recording any information regarding the electronic commerce transaction (negative limitations = no limitation).

16. A method as in claim 1, wherein the action taken with respect to the electronic commerce transaction is selected at least in part by applying predefined rules to the contents of one or more messages that comprise the electronic commerce transaction (column 21).

17. A method as in claim 1, wherein the action taken with respect to the electronic commerce transaction is selected at least in part by applying predefined rules that are independent of the contents of one or more messages that comprise the electronic commerce transaction (columns 21-22).

18. A method as in claim 1, wherein the action taken with respect to the electronic commerce transaction is selected at least in part by applying predefined rules based on at least one of an origin and a destination of the electronic commerce transaction (columns 21-22).

19. A method as in claim 1, wherein the action taken with respect to the electronic commerce transaction is recording at least one predetermined type of information, and further comprising accumulating recorded information from a plurality of electronic commerce transactions providing access to the accumulated recorded information (columns 21-23).

20. A method as in claim 1, wherein the action taken with respect to the electronic commerce transaction is recording at least one predetermined type of information, and further comprising accumulating recorded information from a plurality of electronic commerce transactions, deriving a filtering criterion from the accumulated recorded information, and filtering in the same or in another electronic commerce transaction filter, with the derived filtering criterion (columns 21-23).

21. A method as in claim 1, wherein operating the electronic commerce transaction filter is performed in parallel in a plurality of electronic commerce transaction filters that are disposed between two layers of an administrative domain hierarchy (figures 10-13 and associated text).

22. A method as in claim 1, wherein operating the electronic commerce transaction filter comprises decrypting all or part of the electronic commerce transaction (columns 3-4).

23. A method as in claim 1, wherein the action taken with respect to the electronic commerce transaction is an encryption of all or a part of the electronic commerce transaction using at least

Art Unit: 3621

one cryptographic key, and further comprising sending the at least one cryptographic key to another location (columns 3-4).

24. A method as in claim 1, wherein the action taken with respect to the electronic commerce transaction is a verification that the electronic commerce transaction is in compliance with a predetermined policy (column 21-22).

25. A method as in claim 1, wherein the action taken with respect to the electronic commerce transaction is determining whether the electronic commerce transaction is fraudulent (columns 3-4).

Claims 26-33, 35-45, 48-69 are directed to a computer readable medium and claims 70-80 are directed to a system of the above claimed invention and are rejected as above.

Examiner has pointed out particular references contained in the prior arts of record in the body of this action for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the response, to consider fully the entire references as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior arts or disclosed by the examiner.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bradley B. Bayat whose telephone number is 571-272-6704. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday 8am-6: 30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell can be reached on 571-272-6712. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3621

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

bbb



JAMES P. TRAMMELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600